

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 17, 18, and 20 remain active in this case, Claim 14 having been amended, Claim 19 canceled, and Claim 20 newly added by the present amendment, and Claims 1-13, 15, and 16 having been withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected invention.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 14 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; and Claims 14 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Copeland et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0117282, hereinafter “Copeland”) in view of Steigerwald (U.S. Patent No. 4,047,138).

Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, at the very least because the outstanding Office Action fails to state a basis of indefiniteness for the so rejected claims. Stated differently, the outstanding Office Action fails to indicate that the rejected Claims 14 and 17-19 are not understandable, that persons skilled in the art would not understand what is meant by “a magnetic domain width m of 0.106 mm or less with respect to their longitudinal directions,” as claimed, but instead merely indicates that Applicants should clarify how the magnetic alloy thin ribbons are determined to have magnetic domain width m of 0.106 mm or less with respect to the longitudinal directions. It is respectfully submitted that it is not necessary to recite how this feature is determined in Claim 14 as the Claim 14 is definite as initially presented.

In any event, how the magnetic alloy thin ribbons are determined to have magnetic domain width m of 0.106 mm or less with respect to the longitudinal directions is disclosed in the Example 22 described from page 64, line 11 to page 66, line 7 of the specification. There it is described that a Co base amorphous magnetic alloy thin ribbon having a thickness of 16 μm was subjected to a heat treatment under various conditions to provide it with induced

magnetic anisotropy in an in-plane width direction, thereby the Co base amorphous magnetic alloy thin ribbon having a various magnetic domain width are produced. The magnetic domain width m is a reciprocal number of the number of the magnetic domains per unit length. As shown in Fig. 32, and Table 13, it is apparent that when the magnetic domain width is 0.106 mm or less, the excellent antenna characteristics having a high Q value can be obtained. Accordingly, the magnetic domain width m of 0.106 mm or less with respect to the longitudinal directions is specified in clear and concise terms in Claim 14. Therefore, withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the rejection of Claims 14 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Copeland in view of Steigerwald, this rejection seems to be based on the finding that Copeland discloses the instant claimed invention except for the specific magnetic domain width, but the specific magnetic domain width would have been an obvious design consideration based on the intended applications/environments uses. Applicants respectfully disagree. As mentioned above, the value of the magnetic domain width varies with the heat treatment conditions and the like.

Copeland teaches amorphous alloy ribbons for an antenna, but fails to teach the magnetic domain width having close relations with the antenna characteristics as mentioned above. To further clarify a difference between Applicants' invention and Copeland, Claim 14 has been amended to state expressly that the inductance element is to be used for an antenna, and that the magnetic alloy thin ribbon films are Co based amorphous magnetic alloy thin ribbons, formerly stated in now canceled Claim 19. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Steigerwald at col. 4, line 54 discloses a ferrite magnetic core having a ferrite, which is represented by the chemical formula $MO \bullet F_2O_3$. Since neither Copeland nor Steigerwald

teach a ribbon using a Co based amorphous magnetic alloy, amended Claim 14 is believed to patentably distinguish over both Copeland and Steigerwald whether these references are considered alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding grounds for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\EHK\28\289835US\289835US-AM-DUE-11-13-08.DOC